

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/520,897	07/25/2005	Sverre Sondbo	01526.400500	4936
22852 FINNEGAN 1	7590 08/06/200 HENDERSON FARAE	8 BOW, GARRETT & DUNNER	EXAM	INER
LLP			CARR, DEBORAH D	
	RK AVENUE, NW ON, DC 20001-4413		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	A 1, D C 20001 1110		1621	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## 10/520,897 SONDBO ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

Application No.

Applicant(s)

	Examiner	ALC OILL					
	DEBORAH D. CARR	1621					
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SN/6 (MONTHS from the mailing date of the communication).  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply with the second of the reply within the second for reply with 12 Like. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing aemed patent term adjustment, See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin viil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,				
Status							
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
.4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-14 and 19-29 is/are pending in the at 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)⊠ Claim(s) 1-14 and 19-21 is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 22-29 is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to the Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the lidrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	a 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) 🖾 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) 🖾 All b) 🗀 Some * c) 🗀 None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document:  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document:  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau.  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)	_						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary     Paper No(s)/Mail Da						

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SZ/UE)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/05,10/06,1/07,6/08.

 Notice of Informal Patent Application. 6) Other: \_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections ~ 35 USC § 102

 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim(s) 22-29 are considered pusedo product-by-process claims because they refer back to the process of claim 1 for the low-cholesterol oil. MP.E.P. § 2115 reads, "Product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps."

"Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe, TTT* F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

The structure implied by the process steps should be considered when assessing the patentability of product-by-process claims over the prior art, especially where the product can only be defined by the process steps by which the product is made, or where the manufacturing process steps would be expected to impart distinctive structural

characteristics to the final product. See, e.g., In re Garnero, 412 F.2d 276, 279, 162 USPQ 221, 223 (CCPA 1979)

The use of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections for product-by-process claims has been approved by the courts. "[T]he lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps which must be established.

We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or section 105 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." In re Brown, 459 F.2d 551, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972).

 Claims 22-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Massie et al. (US Pat. 5, 456,018) or Marschner et al. (US Pat. 4,804,555) or Marschner et al. (US Pat. 4,996,072) or Marschner et al. (US Pat. 5,091,117).

The product produced by the claimed process (claims 22–24) does not differ from known oil products having a decreased content of cholesterol produced by other methods.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- Claims 1-14, 19-21 are allowed.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBORAH D. CARR whose telephone number is (571)272-0637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel M. Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspio.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Deborah D Carr/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1621  $\operatorname{Ddc}$